

Ethical and Psychological Harassment in the Workplace

Argiro Trogaidou, Sotiria Triantari

Department of Management Science and Technology, University of Western Macedonia, Greece
trogaidou@gmail.com

Abstract. The phenomenon of harassment is a situation that is increasingly observed in the workplace. Workplace bullying is a significant organizational and social issue. The paper's goal is to record the phenomenon and determine if certain behaviours are considered as harassment. The study aimed to demonstrate the existence of the problem while also illustrating that certain behaviours constitute harassment. The research was conducted through quantitative analysis. An electronic questionnaire was distributed for the purpose of the research in order to define specific behaviors. The research group consisted of bank employees and the eligibility criterion was to be active employees. Data analysis included descriptive and inferential statistics. A total of 101 bank employees joined the study. It was found that 94.10% of the survey participants had experienced harassment. Workplace harassment is a reality that is perceived by employees and usually comes from a hierarchically superior executive. The research findings may be used to improve working conditions, which will have a positive impact on employee performance. In addition, the findings can be used to train employees and supervisors to avoid similar behaviours in the future.

Keywords: Mobbing, Bank, Employees, Workplace, Leadership.

1. Introduction

Many people may relate workplace bullying to a demanding and competitive environment, but this is not always the rule. Bullying behaviours can be displayed in all environments and have to do more with people than the nature of the work. However, some environments may be more conducive to revealing such behaviours. Mobbing, also known as "workplace bullying" involves groups of people targeting an employee for a variety of reasons.

Workplace bullying can be psychological or physical. The behaviour aims to undermine the victim. Victims can be targeted because they're a racial, religious, or gender minority in their workplace or have a disability. The leaders of workplace mobbing may face some kind of personality disorders that lead them to demonstrate such behaviours. Most of the time turn to be charming and charismatic personalities.

Obviously, the worst effects of mobbing are on the victims. After weeks or months of continued bullying, they might experience depression or anxiety and could even manifest physical symptoms such as trouble sleeping, compromised immune system, and stomach aches. The mob's gossip and slander might ruin the victim's professional reputation and also exclude the victim socially. Mobbing does not affect only the victim. It creates a toxic work environment for all employees because of the fear that it could happen to them too. This situation may distract them and cause their productivity to decline. According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (Fader, 2022), approximately one in three employees is a target of aggression at work. The Institute also found that women are most often the targets of this harassment.

While existing research has given substantial evidence on the occurrence, effects, and causes of mobbing, there are still essential knowledge gaps in the field that must be overcome in order to construct successful organizational interventions. A correlation between the manner in which leadership is exercised and the frequency of occurrence of harassing behaviours might fill a significant gap in existing literature. Moreover, studies that attempt to relate employee training to moral and effective communication are limited.

2. Literature review

The term moral harassment in the workplace, which is a global phenomenon, includes concepts such as harassment, intimidation, and aggressive or violent behaviours. Scientists have agreed to use the following terms when referring to workplace harassment.

"Bullying" (Aggression et al., 1978; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel et al., 2001; Salin, 2005)

"Mobbing" (Leymann, 1996; Zapf, 1999)

"Psychological terror" (Leymann, 1996)

"Harassment" (Brodsky, 1976)

"Work Harassment" (Björkqvist et al., 1994)

"Harcèlement Moral" "Moral Harassment" (Hirigoyen, 1998)

"Emotional abuse" "Emotional violence/abuse" (Keashly, 1997)

"Scapegoating" (Thylefors, 2020)

"Workplace incivility" (Pearson et al., 2000)

"Abusive Supervision" (Tepper, 2000)

"Victimization" (Aquino, 2000; ref. Einarsen et al., 2009)

In this paper, the terms bullying and harassment (moral and psychological) are considered identical concepts. Most definitions agree that workplace harassment occurs when someone, continuously and over a long period (usually at least 6 months), is exposed to negative behaviour from one or more people in a situation where, for different reasons, he/she may have difficulties in defending oneself against these actions (Einarsen, 2000; Salin, 2005; Zapf, 1999).

According to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) "Harassment is unwelcome conduct that is based on race, colour, religion, sex (including sexual orientation, gender

identity, or pregnancy), national origin, older age (beginning at age 40), disability, or genetic information (including family medical history). Harassment becomes unlawful where 1) enduring the offensive conduct becomes a condition of continued employment, or 2) the conduct is severe or pervasive enough to create a work environment that a reasonable person would consider intimidating, hostile, or abusive." Additionally, according to the Workplace Bullying Institute "workplace bullying is repeated, health-harming mistreatment by one or more employees of an employee: abusive conduct that takes the form of verbal abuse; or behaviours perceived as threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; work sabotage; or in some combination of the above".

But is workplace bullying really an issue? In one word, yes. Every day, employees are abused and bullied at work. The issue of workplace bullying affects almost one-third of all employees at some point during their careers. According to a research review of 12 studies published online in the National Library of Medicine which took place in 2015 in seven European countries and Australia, workplace bullying is rated at about 11%. A few years after a larger survey carried out in Sweden on a sample of 1856 workers using the NAQ estimated that 20% of the workforce are at significant risk of being bullied or are currently subject to bullying. Apart from research that confirms that employees experience an unpleasant situation at the workplace, there is also confirmation from the medical files of the employees.

2.1 Workplace bullying can be really harmful

Back in 1976 Brodsky (Brodsky, 1976) predicted the devastating consequences of the "mobbing effect" on workers, organizations as well as and society. Spyros Drivas (Kouklaki, 2005) an occupational physician typically states, "bullying is a tactic of psychological terrorism in the workplace and is used by businesses or organizations to get rid of annoying or redundant staff. This tactic has devastating effects on the physical and mental health of employees as well as impacts on the companies themselves since the phenomenon is capable of reducing efficiency by up to 80%." Therefore, the reason why the phenomenon of moral harassment concerns the research community and society is the adverse impact it creates. All theoretical and empirical researches emphasize the unpleasant consequences of the phenomenon of bullying both on the victim and on the company where it takes place.

2.2 To whom it may concern

When actions are systematically and continuously directed at a specific person, they can harm the health and well-being of the worker. Many studies have concluded the existence of a real correlation between bullying and various psychosomatic, psychological, and physical symptoms, such as especially increased anxiety and insomnia. Frequent symptoms such as musculoskeletal problems and depression were reported by many victims of workplace bullying in many European countries. Many victims have a pattern of symptoms such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), often self-loathing and suicidal thoughts. When somebody experiences psychological harassment is at high risk to feel stress (Mucci et al., 2015; Mucci et al., 2015) psychosomatic symptoms (Hansen et al., 2009) fear, anxiety (Leymann, 1996), helplessness, depression (Hansen et al., 2006), cognitive effects (e.g., concentration problems), reduced self-confidence, isolation and loneliness, deterioration of relationships (Chappell & Martino, 2006), shock, aggression, insomnia, apathy (Björkqvist et al., 1994). In conclusion, we could say that the systematic and persistent practice of certain types of bullying renders the victim unable to manage various aspects of his life (Einarsen et al., 2009; Leymann, 1996).

However, it is not only the people who are facing a problem. Serious problems can arise for the organization as well. As (Serafeimidou & DIMOY, 2016) very aptly summarize in their review, one of the most serious implications is turnover, meaning that the target may experience the working conditions as so difficult, that he/she chooses to "voluntarily" leave the job (Glambek et al., 2014). When employees decide to leave an organization, this entails extra costs. This cost concerns the process of selecting and training the new staff. On the other hand, if the employee decides to stay in the organization, there is always the risk of continuous and repeated absences from work which creates costs as well. In addition, repeated absence from work can cause a decrease in job satisfaction and lead

to a proportionate reduction in the employee's productivity Serafeimidou and DIMOY (2016). In general, these side effects can be summarized below

Increased absenteeism

Increased turnover

Increased stress

Increased costs for employee assistance programs (EAPs), recruitment, etc

Increased risk for incidents

Decreased productivity and motivation

Decreased morale

Poor customer service

Source: <https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/bullying.html>

Undoubtedly, all those who lead an organization can contribute a lot to preventing and suppressing the phenomenon. Research has concluded that there is a specific type of leader who can prevent the manifestation of harassing behaviours (Carless et al., 2000; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; i.e., Riggio & Bass, 2005). Transformational leader contributes to preventing harassment by addressing the moral and ethical environment (Burns, 2010) and promoting pro-social values (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). Ethical leadership contributes effectively to the psychological response of employees, not only by declaring their commitment to the organisation but also through better performance at work (Farh et al., 2000). Focusing on the elements of personal honesty and commitment of leaders, the application of ethical leadership contributes to the creation of an educational and supportive environment while increasing the psychological empowerment of employees (Chan et al., 2008). Ethical leadership is characterized by constructive behaviour in providing performance feedback that allows employees to evaluate their abilities and improve (Cheng et al., 2000).

Employees' feelings towards the organisations take the form of emotional reactions to events in the organisation and this has the effect of affecting employees' motivation, performance, loyalty, and long-term job satisfaction (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Since employees have to manage their emotions due to specific situations in the office environment, it is impossible to determine employee behaviours without taking into account their emotional state (Sliter et al., 2010). When individuals express emotions that are incompatible with their personality, negative effects such as emotional exhaustion are likely to occur (Diefendorff et al., 2005). As Triantari (2020) argues, the moral leader takes care of the formation of values, at the same time influencing the culture of each organisation or business. According to Schaubroeck (Schaubroeck et al., 2012), the morally superior leader exerts significant influence on all administrative levels as he gives guidelines for ethical behaviour. In this direction, Triantari (2020, p. 175) adds that the dynamic relationships that develop in a work environment affect the moral and authentic leader and he should take them into account to be fair, and impartial and strengthen equality among his subordinates. This, in itself, will result in motivating employees toward achieving the group's goals and minimizing conflicts between team members.

3. Research Methodology

As already mentioned, the purpose of the research is to examine and record this phenomenon, i.e., if there is harassment in the workplace and if the employees can recognize it, i.e., if they perceive that specific behaviours constitute harassment. The aim was approached with the help of the following research questions:

- What is the degree of harassment experienced by the research participants?
- To what extent do they perceive this harassment?
- Are there any differences in the responses of the sample concerning their individual and work characteristics?

To conduct the research, the Negative Act Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) was used as a research tool. The NAQ-R is a standardized instrument with 23 items that assess perceived experiences of bullying at work (Einarsen et al., 2009) during the past 6 months. All items in the NAQ are written in behavioural terms with no reference to the term bullying. This has the advantage of letting participants respond to each item without having to label themselves as bullied or not. The acts can be categorized as work-related, person-related, or physically intimidating behaviours (Einarsen et al., 2009).

After responding to these items, a definition of bullying at work is introduced and the respondent must indicate whether or not they consider themselves victims of bullying at work according to this definition. The scale has satisfactory reliability and construct validity. Studies have shown that the internal stability of the scale is high, ranging from .87 to .93 as measured by Cronbach's alpha (NAQ-University of Bergen, 2018).

The data was collected using the method of convenience sampling with the aim of the largest possible recording-gathering of observations. Data collection lasted one month.

The only eligibility criterion for participation in the survey was that the participants were working bank employees at the time of the survey.

This research followed all ethical rules that are followed in the context of social research. Initially, the research participants were informed about the purpose, objectives, and way of conducting the research by sending an electronic message. After being informed, the participants received the link to the electronic questionnaire. The online form for completing the questionnaire did not allow the process to start without the acceptance of the research participant.

In the present research, the principle of anonymity and confidentiality was maintained as the participants were asked to answer questions only regarding their demographics. In this way, they did not provide personal information that could reveal their identity. Also, the participants were informed that they could withdraw from the research at any time without having to give a specific reason. Also, none of the participants' email addresses were stored. Finally, the participants were informed that after completing the questionnaires they can contact the researcher to indicate their desire to withdraw from the research.

The research tool of the work was a questionnaire in electronic form. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part concerned the recording of the demographic characteristics of the sample in a total of 8 questions. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the negative behaviour detection questionnaire, the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ - R). This questionnaire is used to measure the frequency and degree of exposure of employees to situations of moral harassment and is a revised version of the original NAQ, and was designed to establish a reliable, valid, comprehensive, and relatively small scale made to be used in a variety of different professional environments. The latest revised edition investigates the frequency of employee exposure to 22 different types of unwanted and negative behaviour, which range from subtle and indirect acts such as gossip to more direct behaviours such as threats of physical violence.

All questions have been formulated so that no mention is made of the term harassment. Based on their workplace experiences over the past six months, participants were asked to indicate how often they experienced 22 negative behaviours on a 5-point scale ranging from "never" to "daily" (never, occasionally, monthly, weekly, daily). Thus, a higher score indicates a higher incidence of negative behaviours.

After completing the questionnaire, the respondents are categorized according to the score into those who:

- They have not been harassed (score <33).
- Have been harassed a few times (score 33 to 44)
- Is the victim's harassment (score > 44)

The 22 statements were followed by a question measuring self-reported victimization by harassment during the past 6 months (based on the same 5-point scale), after participants had been given

a universally accepted definition of bullying at work (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). In addition, through these 22 questions, three determinants were recorded which were characterized as

Personal bullying ' (this includes behaviours such as spreading gossip or rumours and includes questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20)

Work-related bullying " (behaviours such as withholding information that affects the victim's performance and includes questions 1, 3, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21) and

Physical (physical intimidating forms) bullying' (behaviours such as loud voices and sudden anger and includes questions 8, 9, 22).

The third part of the questionnaire aims to investigate the employees' knowledge about mediation through five simple questions.

3.1 Tool reliability

The examination of the reliability of the tool was done with the help of Cronbach's coefficient. The results are presented in table 1 and showed that the NAQ questionnaire is highly reliable ($\alpha = 0.916$) as well as the total questionnaire ($\alpha = 0.900$).

Table 1: Tool reliability

	Cronbach's Alpha	No. Questions
NAQ	0.916	22
Total questionnaire	0.900	29

Source: Own Editing

3.2 Sample description

The final sample of the research was 101 bank employees, most of whom were women ($N=73$, $N\%=72.30\%$). Their demographics are described in table 3.2 and according to them the sample is mainly described by workers aged 36-45 years ($N=74$, $N\%=73.30\%$) with 10-20 years of experience ($N=79$, $N\%= 78.20\%$), who have a university degree or even a master's degree - doctoral degree ($N=95$, $N\%=94\%$) and in a married family situation ($N=83$, $N\%=82.20\%$).

Concerning their work characteristics, the majority of the sample stated that they are employed in a branch of the bank ($N=74$, $N\%=73.30\%$) as employees ($N=67$, $N\%=66.30\%$). About 20% of the sample ($N=19$, $N\%=18.80\%$) stated that the work environment is pleasant and the next most frequent answer was "Boring" ($N=7$, $N\%=6.9\%$). All other responses in the sample (independent or combined) had an occurrence rate of less than 5%.

Table 2: Frequency table of demographic characteristics of the sample.

		N	N%
1) Gender	Man	28	27.7%
	Woman	73	72.3%
2) Age Group	22 -35	3	3.0%
	36 – 45	74	73.3%
	46 -55	21	20.8%
	51 +	3	3.0%
3) Years of Senior Service	<10	5	5.0%
	10-15	37	36.6%
	15-20	42	41.6%
	20+	17	16.8%
4) Educational Level	Graduated from secondary schools	6	5.9%
	University	48	47.5%
	Holder of Masters/Ph.D.	47	46.5%
5) Family condition	Unmarried	13	12.9%
	Divorced	5	5.0%
	Married	83	82.2%

6) Serve:	Branch	74	73.3%	
	Central office	27	26.7%	
7) Position in the Organization	Senior Officer (in central service)	2	2.0%	
	Director	3	3.0%	
	Branch specific role	17	16.8%	
	Head of department (in central service)	2	2.0%	
	Executive Supervisor	18	17.8%	
	Employee	59	58.4%	
8) How would you describe the environment in which you work:	Stressful	67	66.3%	
	Stressful, Boring	1	1.0%	
	Stressful, Pleasant	1	1.0%	
	Stressful, Healthy but sometimes very stressful.	1	1.0%	
	Boring	7	6.9%	
	Pleasant	19	18.8%	
	Calm	1	1.0%	
	Few out of many	1	1.0%	
	Neutral	1	1.0%	
	Compared to the pure private sector it is probably satisfactory	1	1.0%	

Source: Own Editing

Data were coded and then entered into the SPSS statistical program V 23. Then their analysis was carried out with the help of descriptive and inductive statistical methods (t-test and ANOVA to examine the differences in the mean values of the scores per category of the demographic characteristics of the sample).

Finally, the relationships between the variables were examined with the help of Pearson's correlation coefficient, as well as the examination of the simple linear model for the variables of interest. All tests were performed at a significance level of p - level = 0.05.

3.3 Results

Descriptive statistics

The first part of the presentation of the results describes the responses of the sample. According to them, it was observed that all the responses of the sample had an average score lower than the value 4 corresponding to the category "Weekly". The questions with the highest mean scores were 1-6 which refer to personal bullying and work-related bullying. The highest mean score was observed in question 2 "You are assigned an excessive amount of work" (M.T.=3.98, S.A.=1.077), and the lowest in question 22 "You receive threats of physical violence or abuse" (M.T.=1.11, T.A.=0.313).

In addition, it was observed that in the questions with a high mean score the standard deviation was equally high and greater than the value 1 showing that the opinions of the sample varied \pm one category from the one corresponding to the mean value. On the contrary, in lower average scores, which referred to more intense bullying phenomena, the standard deviation was lower, showing the sameness of the views of the sample. These results show that the perception of bullying regarding the work and the personality of a person is done through an individual prism, while in the case of behaviours, which are more easily perceived and contain a common component, the opinions of the employees were the same.

Finally, it was observed that there were cases of zero responses. These cases related to the categories "weekly" and "daily" and were observed in the questions related to extreme behavior such as e.g., in question 21 "Being exposed to an unmanageable workload" and 22 "Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse". These results confirm the conclusion of the previous paragraph, showing again that the research participants do not face any extreme behavior from their colleagues at work.

The next question of the questionnaire concerned the source of the harassment experienced by the research participants. The results showed that the main reported source of employee harassment is their

supervisor (N=52, N%=51.50%) and approximately one-third of the sample stated the peer – colleague as such source (N=31, N %=30.70%).

Table 3: Frequency table of sources of harassment

	No		Yes	
	N	N%	N	N%
Manager	49	48.5%	52	51.5%
Colleagues	70	69.3%	31	30.7%
Subordinates	96	95.0%	5	5.0%

Source: Own Editing

Regarding the meaning of mediation, the results of the employees' responses showed that the bank where the research participants work provides the possibility of reporting negative behaviors (N=94, N%=93.10%) which offers the possibility of anonymity and registered deposit (N=79, N%=78.20%). Almost the entire sample answered that they have not used this service (N=99, N%=98%) while one in two employees (N= 56, N%=55.40%) of the sample answered that they know what is mediation. Finally, the majority of the sample (N=63, N%=62.40%) answered that they would prefer to turn to an external/independent mediator to help them find a solution to this type of behaviour, and about a third of the sample answered that they would prefer to resolve his problem through the human resources department (Certified Ombudsman employee, N=36, N%=35.60%).

To sum up, findings indicate that the perception of bullying related work and a person's personality is done via an individual prism, however in the case of behaviors that are more easily recognized and involve a common component, the employees' perceptions were the same. At work, the research participants do not encounter any extreme conduct from their colleagues. According to the findings, the most common reported source of employee harassment is their supervisor. Finally, the majority of the sample said that they would rather turn to an external/independent mediator to guide them in finding a solution to this sort of behavior, while almost one-third indicated that they would rather address his situation through the human resources department.

3.4 Inductive statistics

Following the presentation of the results of the analysis, the results of the inductive statistics methods are presented for further investigation of the behavior of the sample and the answer to the research questions. The results of the examination of the mean values were done with the help of the t-test of independent samples and the analysis of variance with one factor (one-way ANOVA). The use of parametric procedures was done after examining their normality where it was found that only the physical bullying index deviated from normality according to the Kolmogorov – Smirnov, and Shapiro – Wilk tests. In this case, the parametric procedures were performed based on the central limit theorem as the sample size was greater than 35 observations.

The variables examined were the total score of the NAQ questionnaire and its sub-scales. The results of the independent examination of the total score showed a high mean value (> 44) and a moderate standard deviation. These values showed a wide range (Range = 66) as the minimum value was 25 and the maximum was 91.

Table 4: Measures of Position and Dispersion of the NAQ Total Score.

A. P	Median	T.A.	Range	Min. Price	Max. Price
50.95	47.00	13,801	66	25	91

Source: Own Editing

Categorizing these scores showed that approximately 60% of the sample (N=60, N%=59.40%) were victims of harassment while only 5.90% (N=6) had not been harassed.

Table 5: Frequency table of the degree of harassment of the survey participants

	N	N%
Not they are under consideration harassment	6	5.9
They have been harassed at times	35	34.7
They are victims of harassment	60	59.4
Total	101	100.0

Source: Own Editing

The mean values of the 4 scores (total and sub-scales) of the NAQ questionnaire were then extracted for comparison between them. Results showed that except for the personal bullying mean score, all other scores had similar mean values, standard deviation, and range. A higher mean value was presented in the personal bullying sub-scale (M.T.=2.46) but with a very small difference from the other two mean scores. Finally, the existence of outliers was observed, i.e., values outside the 95% confidence interval of the mean value in the overall mean score and in the personal bullying sub-scale.

Examining the correlations between scores and question 23 showed that all scores are correlated with each other. Correlations between the 4 scores were all strong (>0.7) and positive. Correlations with question 23 showing the degree of perception of harassment showed moderate correlations with the highest value appearing concerning exposure to personal bullying. This result shows that an employee will perceive harassment more when it concerns direct bullying and to a lesser extent when it concerns indirect bullying, either through work or physical bullying.

The results of the examination of the mean values showed that the degree of bullying is not affected by the demographic characteristics of the employees as in no case were statistically significant differences in the mean scores found. The only statistically significant factor was the characterization of the work environment by the survey participants. In this case, it was found that employees who described their work environment as neutral or calm had lower scores of bullying and exposure to personal bullying compared to those who described it as stressful and boring.

The examination of any differences in the degree of perception of bullying through question 23 resulted in the appearance of statistically significant differences in the factor's years of service and educational level. In these cases, it was observed that employees with less than 10 years of service or between 15-20 are more aware of the case of attempted intimidation as are employees who have a master's or doctoral degree.

The mean values of the 4 scores and the perception of bullying were then examined to investigate any differences concerning the sample's responses to questions 24-29. The results showed that the supervisor, as a source of bullying, is the most important factor differentiating the degree of bullying in the sample in all cases. Thus, it was found that employees who reported their supervisor as a source of bullying scored higher mean scores (greater degree of bullying) compared to those who did not report it as a source of bullying as well as the perception of bullying.

Also, it was observed that those employees who mentioned the subordinate as a factor of bullying scored higher overall bullying score compared to those who did not make such mention. Finally, employees who used the reporting service had higher personal bullying scores than those who did not use this service.

The last part of the analysis involved examining a multiple regression model with dependent variable question 23 "Have you experienced bullying-harassment at work?" and independent of the 4 scores of the NAQ questionnaire. The results showed that the optimal model describes the relationship: $Q_{23} = 0.061 * Personal Bullying_{(<0.001)} - 0.252_{(0.302)}$

This model is statistically significant ($F(1,99) = 58.465, p < 0.001$), moderately interpretable ($R^2 = 0.371$) and shows that the perception of workplace bullying depends only on exposure to personal bullying but to a low degree.

4. Conclusions

Concerning the research questions

What is the degree of harassment experienced by the research participants?

The results of the survey showed that the phenomenon of bullying was important to the survey participants. More specifically, it was found that 94.10% of the participants in the research had suffered a moderate or greater degree of harassment. This high percentage referred mainly to personal bullying and bullying at work and a lesser extent to physical bullying. A more detailed examination of the sample's responses to the NAQ questionnaire questions showed that they perceive the incidents they experience through their perception. These incidents concern work and personal harassment, while in the case of physical bullying common perceptions were observed.

To what extent do they perceive this harassment?

The sample's perception of bullying was low as only 12.90% indicated that they perceive some kind of bullying in their workplace although the correlation between their perception and the intensity of bullying was at moderate levels. The results of the survey showed that an employee is more likely to perceive bullying when it is personal and is done by his supervisor as well as employees with little work experience and holders of a master's or dictatorial title.

Are there any differences in the responses of the sample concerning their individual and work characteristics?

The results of the research showed that the demographic characteristics of the research participants do not change the opinions of the sample either in the degree of bullying they experience or in their perception. The only factors found to change their views were job characteristics with the most important factor being the supervisor as a source of intimidation.

When the harassment is done by the supervisor then it is expected that he is higher in rank and more easily perceived by the employee. It was also observed that employees who have a lower degree of bullying will characterize their work environment more positive and that only in the case of personal bullying is an employee expected to make use of the reporting service.

5. Future studies

The number of answers was limited due to the short period it lasted. This may have led to unsafe conclusions. It would be interesting to conduct a similar study on a much larger sample in the future. The research was not geographically limited, we had responses from all Greek cities. Additionally, a qualitative study is required to show the nature of the relation between negative affect and psychological harassment.

Appendix

NAQ Questionnaire

FIRST PART

Demographic Information

Please check the suitable box

1) Gender

- a) Man
- b) Woman

2) Age Group

- a) 22 -35
- b) 36 – 45
- c) 46 -55
- d) 51 +

3) Years of work

- a) <10
- b) 10-15
- c) 15-20
- d) 20+

4) Educational Level

- a) High school graduate
- b) University
- c) Holder of a Master's/PhD

5) Marital status

- a) Married
- b) Single
- c) Widowhood
- d) Divorced

6) Serve:

- a) Branch
- b) Central Service

7) Position in the Organization

- a) Employee
- b) Branch specific role
- c) Executive-supervisor
- d) Deputy Director
- e) Director
- f) Head of department (in a central service)
- g) Senior official (in a central service)

8) Determine the source of the harassment:

- a) Manager
- b) Subordinate
- c) Colleague

9) How would you describe your workplace:

- a) Stressful
- b) Pleasant
- c) Boring
- d) Other (Specify).....

SECOND PART

Please respond to the following statements according to the graded Likert Scale that best expresses your opinion or by responding in the manner specified by each question.

Never	Occasionally	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1	2	3	4	5

Negative Acts Questionnaire – Revised (NAQ-R)

<p>These statements describe your interactions with your coworkers. For each statement please rate the frequency with which you experience the following interactions by CIRCLING the appropriate number.</p>		Daily				
		Weekly				
		Monthly				
		Occasionally				
		Never				
1.	Someone withholding information which affects your performance	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Being ignored or excluded	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, your attitudes, or your private life	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Persistent criticism of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Having your opinions ignored	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Having allegations made against you	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Excessive monitoring of your work	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g. sick leave, holiday)	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	1	2	3	4	5

Question No 23

✓ "bullying is defined as the situation in which one or more people are the recipients of negative behaviours from one or more perpetrators and in which the recipient(s) of the negative behaviours have difficulty protecting themselves. Individual one-on-one confrontation does not fall within the definition of bullying."

Given the above definition please indicate the extent to which you have experienced the described behaviour at work in the past 6 months.

Never	Occasionally	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1	2	3	4	5

Questions about reporting and mediation

1. Does the bank you work for give you the ability to report negative behaviour? D
 YES
 NO

2. The reporting in what way is better to be done: T
 Branded statement
 Anonymously
 Both ways

3. Have you used the reporting service? H
 YES
 NO

4. Do you know what Mediation is and how it could solve problems arising from negative behaviours? D
 YES
 NO

5. It would be more familiar to you to contact to an external/independent certified Mediator to help you find a solution or you prefer the assistance of the Human Resources Department. It
 Independent certified Mediator
 Certified employee (Human Resources Department)

References

- Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping BOYS, D. Olweus. Washington, Hemisphere Publ. Corp., (1978). No. of pages: xiii 4 + 218. (1980). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420100124>
- Aquino, K. (2000). Structural and Individual Determinants of Workplace Victimization: The Effects of Hierarchical Status and Conflict Management Style. *Journal of Management*, 26(2), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600201>
- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 20(3), 173–184.
- Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. Lexington Books.
- Burns, J. M. (2010). *Leadership*. HarperCollins.
- Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A Short Measure of Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14(3), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022991115523>
- Chappell, D., & Martino, D. V. (2006). *Violence at Work* (third edition). International Labour Office.
- Chan, Y. H., Taylor, R. R., & Markham, S. (2008). The role of subordinates' trust in a social exchange-driven psychological empowerment process. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20, 444–467.
- Farh, L. J. L., Cheng, B., & Chou, L. (2000). A Triad Model of Paternalistic Leadership: Constructs and Measurement. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 14, 3.
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., & Farh, J. L. (2000). A triad model of paternalistic leadership: The constructs and measurement. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 14: 364 (in Chinese *Huang, MP, & Farh, JL (2004). Paternalistic Leadership*
- Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 339–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.02.001>
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 5(4), 379–401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789\(98\)00043-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(98)00043-3)
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370902815673>
- Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432960841485>
- Fader, S. (2022, July 12). *What Workplace Bullying Laws Actually Exist? | BetterHelp*. Better Help. Retrieved August 11, 2022, from <https://www.betterhelp.com/advice/bullying/what-workplace-bullying-laws-actually-exist/>
- Glambek, M., Matthiesen, S. B., Hetland, J., & Einarsen, S. (2014). Workplace bullying as an antecedent to job insecurity and intention to leave: a 6-month prospective study. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12035>
- Hansen, S. M., Blangsted, A. K., Hansen, E. A., Sjøgaard, K., & Sjøgaard, G. (2009). Physical activity, job demand–control, perceived stress–energy, and salivary cortisol in white-collar

workers. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 83(2), 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-009-0440-7>

Hansen, S. M., Høgh, A., Persson, R., Karlson, B., Garde, A. H., & Ørbæk, P. (2006). Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 60(1), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2005.06.078>

www.eeoc.gov. (n.d.). US EEOC. Retrieved August 9, 2022, from <https://www.eeoc.gov/harassment>

Hirigoyen, M. (1998). *Le harcèlement moral: La violence perverse au quotidien (French Edition)*. Syros.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 443–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000780>

Keashly, L. (1997). Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1(1), 85–117. https://doi.org/10.1300/j135v01n01_05

Kouklaki, D. K. (2005, May 5). *Ένας στους δέκα δουλεύει υπό καθεστώς εκφοβισμού*. TA NEA. Retrieved August 11, 2022, from <https://www.tanea.gr/2005/05/05/greece/enas-stoys-deka-doyleyei-y-po-kathestws-ekfobismoy/>

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>

Mucci, N., Giorgi, G., Cupelli, V., Giofrè, P. A., Rosati, M. V., Tomei, F., Tomei, G., Bresó-Esteve, E., & Arcangeli, G. (2015). Work-related stress assessment in a population of Italian workers. The Stress Questionnaire. *Science of The Total Environment*, 502, 673–679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.09.069>

NAQ. (2018). University of Bergen. Retrieved August 12, 2022, from <https://www.uib.no/en/rg/bbrg/44045/naq>

OSH Answers Fact Sheets. (2020). <https://www.ccohs.ca/>. Retrieved August 11, 2022, from <https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/bullying.html>

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2), 123–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616\(00\)00019-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616(00)00019-x)

Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 41–65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843\(02\)00183-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00183-2)

Riggio, R. E., & Bass, B. M. (2005). *Transformational Leadership: A Comprehensive Review of Theory and Research* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Schaubroeck, J. M., Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Lord, R. G., Treviño, L. K., Dimotakis, N., & Peng, A. C. (2012). Embedding Ethical Leadership within and across Organization Levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1053–1078. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0064>

Salin, D. (2005). Workplace Bullying among Business Professionals: Prevalence, Gender Differences and the Role of Organizational Politics. *Perspectives Interdisciplinaires Sur Le Travail et La Santé*, 7–3. <https://doi.org/10.4000/pistes.3159>

Serafeimidou, A. S., & DIMOY, M. D. (2016, June). *Workplace bullying with special emphasis in the Greek public sector – a review article*. 11th MIBES Conference, 22–24 June 2016, Heraklion, Greece. <http://mibes.teilar.gr/proceedings/2016/Serafeimidou-Dimou.pdf>

Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labour as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(4), 468–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020723>

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of Abusive Supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.5465/1556375>

Thylefors, I. (2020). *AO-konsulten : En handbok i arbets- och organisationspsykologi*. Natur & Kultur Läromedel. *What is workplace bullying?* (n.d.-a). Workplace Bulling Institute. Retrieved August 9, 2022, from <https://workplacebullying.org>

Triantari, S. T. (2020). *Leadership, Leadership Theories. From the Aristotelian Orator to the modern Leader* (1st ed.). K. & M. STAMOULI Publishing House.

Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of The Structure, Cause and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268669>